

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Notes on Project 32.2366

P. 2, ll. 2-3

Doesn't the history as such cover the period before 1950?

P. 3, 4 ll. up

Many?

P. 5, last para.

Are scarce items exported?

P. 8, 2d tabulation

Increases are overstated. Thus the output of excavators in 1950 was 12.9 times that of 1940, but the increase was only 11.9 times.

P. 7, Section A

Since this portion covers only the early history, shouldn't it be dated? E.g., "History to 1950."

P. 15, 2d para.

Make footnotes of this and subsequent long parenthetical remarks.

P. 18, tabulations

Note suggested changes in column headings.

P. 19, note

Add: in 1955 prices. Also, GRR practice requires that some statement be made as to \$ value, either at official rate with stated reservations, or other rate.

P. 20, bottom

Are any comparable value figures available?

P. 23, 1st full para.

Growth of 8% per year looks somewhat low. How was this figured? I estimate 10.5%.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

Notes (continued)

Pp. 36-38, Figures 1, 3, 4

Should be sourced.

P. 37, Figure 3

What is basis for belief that this equipment is confined to that held by the construction industry?

P. 56, App. C, 2. Multibucket Excavators

Check gross value of types ER-2 and -4. Shouldn't it be 225 th. rubles? Recheck total on p. 60.

P. 61

"Consumption" is somewhat ambiguous. Acquisition? Heading should be dated. A note should be added to indicate to the reader the general method by which unit requirements were estimated.

CONFIDENTIAL